

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 93 04:30:09 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #246
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 22 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 246

Today's Topics:

 Call sign snobbery (2 msgs)
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk
 STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 23:44:40 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-
state.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!csn!csn!stortek!georgen@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1737@arrl.org> jkearman.org (Jim Kearman) writes:
>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jreid@csugrad.cs.vt.edu (Joe Reid) writes:
>
>calls ran out, FCC began issuing 2 X 3 calls, starting with WA,
>then going to WB. They skipped WC for amateur calls, then started
>issuing WD calls.

I seem to remember that WC had been assigned to another service.

>
>When all the 1 X 2s were issued (to Extras) in a district, FCC
>began issuing 2 X 1 calls. I believe the separate calls for

I might also point out that the original 1x2 or 1x3 calls did not include

the letter X after the number (such as W6XYZ). These calls had been reserved for experimental (ie non amateur) calls. The calls were added to the "pool" around 1975(apprx). Note that 2x3 calls such as "KA2XDN" are still reserved for "experimental" licenses issued by the FCC.

Just my 2 cents.

73/72 de George, W1XE

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 23:54:58 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!csn!csn!stortek!georgen@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22arnp\$j95@senator-bedfellow.MIT.EDU> cthomas@athena.mit.edu (Michael T Ford) writes:

>In article <Pine.3.07.9307171745.A23025-a1000000@uafhp.uark.edu>

>plaws@uafhp.uark.edu (Peter Laws) writes:

>>

>>If the suffix started with an X it was an experimental station.

>

>Experimental in what sense? Isn't that what ham is about?

>

>

>--Michael T. Ford WZ0C

> <cthomas@MIT.edu>

> W1XM, the oldest school club in the country

>

There really is an "experimental license" class that will allow you to "operate - without interference" (that is, you cannot interfere with anyone else) on any frequency (practically) you want, provided you get the license. Yes, there is a lengthy application which requires you to specifically spell out why you want it, freq, mode of operation etc. This is a non-amateur license. Basically costs nothing but paperwork and time. Calls are given out in the form of "KA2XDN", 2 does not necessarily correspond to the hamradio districts.

73 George Noyes, W1XE email: georgen@redwood.stortek.com

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 93 23:01:28 GMT
From: unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!news-

feed-2.peachnet.edu!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!
orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet@mvp.saic.com
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul21.014331.966@cyphyn.UUCP> randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:
>

>Excuse me! Can I point out something everyone seems to be overlooking?

Not everyone is overlooking your point....

> It is not hazing.....the tests are to find out if or not one knows what
>they are doing, to try and make sure that responsible people are going to
>be at the controls.

The tests are not intended to find out if generally responsible people are at the controls. The tests are an effort to certify that an amateur radio operator is sufficiently knowledgeable to be trusted to build, adjust and operate radio equipment in conformance with Part 97. Part 97 goes on to state that the purpose and goals of the amateur radio service. One of the goals of the amateur radio service, according to Part 97, is to provide a pool of trained radio operators. When the amateur radio service as we know it today was invented, one of the attributes of a useful radio operator was the knowledge of CW, therefore radio amateurs were required to learn CW. CW also became entrenched in an international treaty.

> Back in '33 one had to know how to dip the plate (NO! it is not a
>procedure used in a restaurant), or there would be some serious problems.
> Back in '33 the 2 major modes of transmission were CW and AM...so, one
>had to know how to operate their rigs accordingly, and the tests were to
>find out if you did or not.
> Now, with all these new sets, that auto-tune, and all kinds of transmission
>modes....most fully automatic...all one does is push the SEND button...
>it's not so great a concern about how one runs their rig, but how they will
>communicate over it.

Nonetheless, you are still permitted to build and adjust radio equipment, even though it is easier than it once was.

> However, the tests are not quite 'right' and so instead of being a means
>to insure one knows what they are doing, well.....

The tests still focus on the most salient issues in front of ham radio today; the rules, regulations and technical standards. Even though radios are easier to operate, there are a great many regulations to know. Sure, the tests don't focus on "how do you build a radio?"; this is not as salient to the goals of Part 97 as it once was.

> It has ended up being a last defence against letting in all kinds of
> people who'd use it like how C/B is being used....miserably adjusted rigs,
> radio-terrorism (intentional QRM), a podium to air ones hate and dislikes
> (practically broadcasting) of some of the most-to-be-avoided topics there
> are, generally carefree and disregarding everything but what THEY want.
>
> That is not wanted , thats not what Ham radio is for, and people are seeing
> such stuff creep in, and are concerned!

These last two paragraphs are more of an opinion than observation of fact.

> So, the test , has ended up being a sort of hurdle, with maybe this idea:
> If they can't put in the time /effort to learn a little CW and some very
> basic theory, then they are not serious about being responsible people, and
> so they may be best to get a 27mc radio.

The test is still trying to accomplish the goals of Part 97. The focus is on rules, regs and technical standards, though the Advanced test is rather theory focused. The issue is not about being generally responsible and disciplined enough to learn CW; the issue is being responsible about operating a radio.

> I would like to see the tests reflect more of what is really needed:

[other stuff deleted... mostly motherhood..]

> So same for ... well lets say CW....To be authorized to use CW, one must
> be able to send and receive it , readably. (I hear some cheers somewhere)

The tests already reflect this; to use CW, one must be able to send and receive it, readably. If one cannot send and receive CW, then one cannot use CW. Other than the international treaty, I see no reason whatsoever to require a test of CW skill. If a person wants to use CW, they will. If a person is not interested in CW and does not learn it, they will not use CW. Is this so bad?

> Does anyone have any idea just what kind of Pandora's box would be opened
> if both CW and theory tests were done away with????
> 1912 Bedlam!

Who had proposed doing away with all tests? As a "CW reformist", I support abolishing the 13 and 20 WPM tests, possibly replacing them with extended written tests intended as a test of skill. A compromise I would accept is offering one the choice of CW or written skill test.

When the international treaty requiring knowledge of CW for amateurs below 30 Mhz is changed to delete this requirement, I will ask that the 5 WPM test be abolished or replaced with a test of skill.

These written tests of skill would require one to calculate and write, and would not have multiple choice questions. These tests would test skills salient to radio today, such as computer programming ;-).

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 93 16:34:43 EDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!wariat.org!nraven!floyd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

> In article <CAIpCC.MsL@dartvax.dartmouth.edu>, Kenneth.E.Harker@Dartmouth.Edu
> |> In article <22i5vt\$9k6@techbook.techbook.com>
> |> genew@techbook.techbook.com (Gene Wolford) writes:
> |>
> |> > I called the ARRL VE info number, 1-800-9ARRLVE.
> |>

[Messages Deleted]

Can you guys say W5YI???

I'll bet you can now! :) Unfortunately most of us have learned the hard way that you don't want an ARRL VE to be involved in your upgrading, or initial licensing.....

And just think!!! They're going to take over some of the licensing aspects..... hmm, I hope no one want a club call for the next decade or so...

73 de N8VUR / Doug

__Douglas A. Dever__ floyd@nraven.wariat.org

QSO on 444.600 or 146.520 anytime!

Date: 21 Jul 1993 14:11:14 -0700

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!mojo.eng.umd.edu!news.isi.com!news.isi.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <16JUL199308062528@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <CAHCHC.C71@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<1993Jul21.153004.145877@locus.com>d.edu

Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <1993Jul21.153004.145877@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>While it is true many people can learn CW, much like many people can
>learn to play the piano, Erich does have a valid point. It appears
>that people who do not know CW are viewed as lesser people by the
>morse fanatics. It is effectively a prejudice. It would seem that
>"morse fanatics" automatically assume that a person that doesn't
>know Morse code is lazy or wants something for free.
>
>*You* may not feel this way, but this is an attitude I've frequently
>seen among the people I regard as "morse fanatics". This attitude is
>not friendly, and effectively is the same as a racial or ethnic bigotry.

There should be a distinction here between those who argue for more
entry barriers, such as the code test, and those who look down on
people they feel may not have earned their place in the hobby.

I agree that there are hams out there who despise the no-code hams, and I
agree that this is wrong. These hams have passed all the required tests
and should be accorded all the respect due to them.

However, I don't think there is anything wrong with those who argue that
entry barriers are necessary. This is not the same thing as bigotry.

--

Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com)		"Violence is the last refuge of
Integrated Systems, Inc.		the incompetent" - Isaac Asimov

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 93 22:36:47 GMT
From: ncrqw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>,
<16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>ub2
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com> jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323)
writes:

>
>But look at how the vast majority of new hams operate: they buy a commercial
>rig, antenna, and coax from HRO, plug it into the wall, connect the cables
>and start operating. The vast majority never use even the smallest shred
>of "theory" they may have accidentally learned while "studying" for their
>license.
>
>Why should this "theory" be so important for licensing purposes when
>it is almost never used? What does Ohm's Law have to do with buying a
>handheld and yapping on two-meter repeaters? It has about the same

What does buying a handheld and yapping on two-meter repeaters have to do
with amateur radio? I know several people like this (typically the
accommodating spouse of someone more involved in ham radio) and they not
only don't know what they're missing, they're not interested. They use
their radios like they'd use a cellular phone.

The arguments I hear from ARRL and others saying something to the effect
that we as amateurs have more in common than we have differences, that
there is room for everyone and their brothers' modes, that we must work
together to advance the hobby, etc., is PC garbage.

My alternate theory is: We Are What We Eat.

Dumbing down the theory tests and eliminating the CW test in order to
"revitalize" the hobby by taking in many new hams is like eating
empty calories. The ham radio hobby in a few years is going to be
like the stereotypical 400 lb ham operator firmly planted in his
operating position. To be sure, not all of those calories are empty.
But I know of so many CB transplants who are just that, and use their
2M radios like extended-range CB's. These people they are perfectly
content to trash the 2M repeaters and, to them, that's what amateur radio
is all about. They have no desire to expand their horizons. They are
inhabiting the VHF bands in increasing numbers. They will eventually
define Amateur Radio in their own image. We Are What We Eat.

Of course I live in Southern California, 2M Repeater Hell, so perhaps

that has made me overly cynical. I welcome other comments.

--

```
[] [] [] [] Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ NCR Torrey Pines
>[] [] [] [] kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com (619) 597-3602
>[] [] [] [] kevin%beacons@cyber.net
>[] [] [] [] 
>[] [] [] [] Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.
```

Date: 22 Jul 93 02:06:59 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
<22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>, <1993Jul21.223647.27884@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com (Kevin Sanders) writes:

>Dumbing down the theory tests and eliminating the CW test in order to
>"revitalize" the hobby by taking in many new hams is like eating
>empty calories....
>But I know of so many CB transplants who are just that, and use their
>2M radios like extended-range CB's. These people they are perfectly
>content to trash the 2M repeaters and, to them, that's what amateur radio
>is all about. They have no desire to expand their horizons. They are
>inhabiting the VHF bands in increasing numbers. They will eventually
>define Amateur Radio in their own image. We Are What We Eat.

Amen! At long last another voice speaks the truth. Yeah, its not politically correct, and no doubt you're going to receive a ton of flame mail attempting to berate you, but rest assured that there are thousands of amateurs out there who agree with you. In fact, I daresay that the *majority* of radio amatuers (excluding the no-clues, that is) would agree with you, except that they would have to deal with the harassing flame mail if they did.

The welfare-state mentality of this country has finally hit home in Amateur Radio. People claim it is "too hard", or

```
#define NASAL_WHINE ON
```

Whhhhhhy should I have to do the code? Its out-daaaaaaated.

```
#define NASAL_WHINE OFF
```


All of this has given way to the "want-it-all-for-no-work" individuals to get involved in the hobby.

At what point do we stop "dumbing down" the tests? When someone microwaves his family when attempting to work 1.2 gigahertz? Or, when someone's house blows up due to his HF rig being grounded to the natural-gas inlet in his house? Or, do we just consider these types of incidents (and believe me, eventually they will happen, if they haven't happened already) "survival of the fittest" and be happy that their genes have been eliminated from the gene pool?

Of course, amateur radio organizations like the ARRL are to blame as well. Especially those that supported the no-code license, and the VECs who are "dumbing down" the theory tests to "make it easier". Their motto: Quantity before Quality. After all, quantity means more memberships. More memberships means a greater circulation base for QST, and a greater circulation base means greater advertising revenues.

>Of course I live in Southern California, 2M Repeater Hell, so perhaps
>that has made me overly cynical. I welcome other comments.

146.700 is the local "no-clue" hangout. Unfortunately, its also the repeater with the best coverage (virtually the entire state of RI) so I guess its prone to that sort of thing.

Its really funny, though, whenever I get on HF and ask what the local 2 meter VHF scene is like, the answer is 95% of the time the same as yours. Some people like the no-clue license, but most of the ones I've talked to think it has ruined local VHF communications.

Do not despair. Other amateurs recognize this fact. Some of them are forming local organizations designed to keep the no-clue scum out of the local scene. For example, the Rhode Island 2x2 Amateur Repeater Association has a \$4,000 membership application fee for no-clues. Novices are \$2,000, Generals \$1,000, Advanced \$500, and Extra \$250. People who upgrade within a year of joining get a refund between the difference.

Don't be fooled by the virulent pro-no-cluers here. This is USENET. Bastillion of the liberal mentality borne from the Universities at which is was founded. Their welfare-state mentality of making it "fair" for everyone means the eventual elimination of all requirements. Already the no-cluers are crying for HF privs. Pretty soon, just open

the box, take out your radio and your license, and get on the air.

MD

Date: 21 Jul 1993 13:55:36 -0700
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!mojo.eng.umd.edu!news.isi.com!news.isi.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
<22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>,
<POPOVICH.93Jul20145616@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>.com
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <POPOVICH.93Jul20145616@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>
popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com (Steve Popovich) writes:
>>So if "theory" doesn't have anything to do with operating competency, why
>>require it? If the code test is hazing, then so is the theory test.
>
>Because ham radio licensees are allowed to build and repair their own
>equipment, and the theory is important for that privilege. Of course,
>what they test is pretty minimal, and it's easy to argue that perhaps
>a tougher theory test should be required in order to homebrew

This is a well-thought-out response and I'm almost inclined to go along
with it, but for one thing... How many "average" hams can build or
repair an average modern ham rig given the amount of theory they learn
for the exam? Many learn nothing at all; they simply memorize the question
pool or guess at the answers (that's why the test is jokingly referred to
as multiple-guess). And how many hams today build their own gear? I'll
bet not one in 500.

And given that modern rigs are crammed with surface-mount components,
highly integrated ICs, and enough software to choke a Cray, even a ham
who did learn some theory along the way has almost no hope of being
able to repair these rigs.

--
Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com) | "Violence is the last refuge of
Integrated Systems, Inc. | the incompetent" - Isaac Asimov

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #246
